REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 8, 21, 27, 28-30, 39 and 47 are amended. Claim 26 is canceled. Claims 49-51 are added. Claims 1-25 and 27-51 remain in the application for consideration. In view of the following remarks, Applicant traverses the Office's rejections and respectfully requests that the application be forwarded on to issuance.

Allowable Claims

Claim 26 is indicated as allowable but for depending from a rejected base claim. Applicant thanks the examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. This claim has been canceled and is re-presented, along with the subject matter of its independent claim 23, as new independent claim 49. Accordingly, this claim should be summarily allowed.

Claims 50 and 51 depend from claim 49 and should be summarily allowed as depending from an allowable base claim.

Claim Objections

Claims 11, 21, 22, 29, 47 and 48 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office fails to indicate why these claims fail to further limit the subject matter of the claims from which each depends.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are in proper dependent form. As an example, consider claim 11 which depends from claim 1. Claim 1 recites a ***software-implemented video rendering system*** comprising:

- a video application configured to enable a user to combine multiple different video clips; and
- a bitmap processor operatively coupled with the video application and configured to receive a first bitmap that can be used to render a transition between video clips and automatically process the first bitmap to provide a different transition between video clips, wherein the first bitmap does not comprise video clip content.

Claim 11 recites computer-readable media having software code that implements the video rendering system of claim 1. Thus, while claim 1 is directed to the ***actual components*** of the system, claim 11 is directed to software code on a computer-readable media that implements the system. To assist in appreciating this difference, consider that claim 1 recites that the bitmap processor is ***operatively coupled*** with the video application. Claim 11, on the other hand, simply recites computer-readable media having software code that ***implements*** the video rendering system of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 11 does indeed further define the subject matter of claim 1 and is hence in proper form.

Claim 21 recites a video application that is embodied on a computer readable medium and programmed to implement the method of claim 12. Claim 12 is simply a method claim that makes no mention of the entity that performs its steps. As claim 21 positively recites such an entity, it further limits the subject matter of its independent claim. The same can be said of claim 22.

Likewise, similar arguments can be made with respect to claims 29, 47 and 48.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's objections of these claims.

§112 Rejections

Claims 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite with respect to the phrase "shrinking/stretching". Applicant has amended these claims to recite "shrinking and stretching" thus traversing the Office's rejection.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office argues that the claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to the skilled artisan that the inventor had possession of the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Office argues that the detailed description fails to describe how more than one computer-readable media having the recited instructions are put together to perform the recited steps.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Office's rejection of this claim and traverses the rejection. Applicant respectfully refers the Office to the description of Fig. 2 which is reproduced in its entirety below:

> **Fig. 2** illustrates an example of a suitable computing environment 200 on which the system and related methods for processing media content may be implemented.
>
> It is to be appreciated that computing environment 200 is only one example of a suitable computing environment and is not intended to suggest any limitation as to the scope of use or functionality of the media processing system. Neither should the computing environment 200 be interpreted as having any dependency or requirement relating to any one or

combination of components illustrated in the exemplary computing environment 200.

The media processing system is operational with numerous other general purpose or special purpose computing system environments or configurations. Examples of well known computing systems, environments, and/or configurations that may be suitable for use with the media processing system include, but are not limited to, personal computers, server computers, thin clients, thick clients, hand-held or laptop devices, multiprocessor systems, microprocessor-based systems, set top boxes, programmable consumer electronics, network PCs, minicomputers, mainframe computers, distributed computing environments that include any of the above systems or devices, and the like.

In certain implementations, the system and related methods for processing media content may well be described in the general context of computer-executable instructions, such as program modules, being executed by a computer. Generally, program modules include routines, programs, objects, components, data structures, etc. that perform particular tasks or implement particular abstract data types. The media processing system may also be practiced in distributed computing environments where tasks are performed by remote processing devices that are linked through a communications network. In a distributed computing environment, program modules may be located in both local and remote computer storage media including memory storage devices.

In accordance with the illustrated example embodiment of Fig. 2 computing system 200 is shown comprising one or more processors or processing units 202, a system memory 204, and a bus 206 that couples various system components including the system memory 204 to the processor 202.

Bus 206 is intended to represent one or more of any of several types of bus structures, including a memory bus or memory controller, a peripheral bus, an accelerated graphics port, and a processor or local bus using any of a variety of bus architectures. By way of example, and not limitation, such architectures include Industry Standard Architecture (ISA) bus, Micro Channel Architecture (MCA) bus, Enhanced ISA (EISA) bus, Video Electronics Standards Association (VESA) local bus, and Peripheral Component Interconnects (PCI) buss also known as Mezzanine bus.

Computer 200 typically includes a variety of computer readable media. Such media may be any available media that is locally and/or

remotely accessible by computer 200, and it includes both volatile and non-volatile media, removable and non-removable media.

In Fig. 2, the system memory 204 includes computer readable media in the form of volatile, such as random access memory (RAM) 210, and/or non-volatile memory, such as read only memory (ROM) 208. A basic input/output system (BIOS) 212, containing the basic routines that help to transfer information between elements within computer 200, such as during start-up, is stored in ROM 208. RAM 210 typically contains data and/or program modules that are immediately accessible to and/or presently be operated on by processing unit(s) 202.

Computer 200 may further include other removable/non-removable, volatile/non-volatile computer storage media. By way of example only, Fig. 2 illustrates a hard disk drive 228 for reading from and writing to a non-removable, non-volatile magnetic media (not shown and typically called a "hard drive"), a magnetic disk drive 230 for reading from and writing to a removable, non-volatile magnetic disk 232 (e.g., a "floppy disk"), and an optical disk drive 234 for reading from or writing to a removable, non-volatile optical disk 236 such as a CD-ROM, DVD-ROM or other optical media. The hard disk drive 228, magnetic disk drive 230, and optical disk drive 234 are each connected to bus 206 by one or more interfaces 226.

The drives and their associated computer-readable media provide nonvolatile storage of computer readable instructions, data structures, program modules, and other data for computer 200. Although the exemplary environment described herein employs a hard disk 228, a removable magnetic disk 232 and a removable optical disk 236, it should be appreciated by those skilled in the art that other types of computer readable media which can store data that is accessible by a computer, such as magnetic cassettes, flash memory cards, digital video disks, random access memories (RAMs), read only memories (ROM), and the like, may also be used in the exemplary operating environment.

A number of program modules may be stored on the hard disk 228, magnetic disk 232, optical disk 236, ROM 208, or RAM 210, including, by way of example, and not limitation, an operating system 214, one or more application programs 216 (e.g., multimedia application program 224), other program modules 218, and program data 220. In accordance with the illustrated example embodiment of Fig. 2, operating system 214 includes an application program interface embodied as a render engine 222. As will be developed more fully below, render engine 222 is exposed to higher-level

applications (e.g., 216) to automatically assemble filter graphs in support of user-defined development projects, e.g., media processing projects. Unlike conventional media processing systems, however, render engine 222 utilizes a scalable, dynamically reconfigurable matrix switch to reduce filter graph complexity, thereby reducing the computational and memory resources required to complete a development project. Various aspects of the innovative media processing system represented by a computer 200 implementing the innovative render engine 222 will be developed further, below.

Continuing with Fig. 2, a user may enter commands and information into computer 200 through input devices such as keyboard 238 and pointing device 240 (such as a "mouse"). Other input devices may include a audio/video input device(s) 253, a microphone, joystick, game pad, satellite dish, serial port, scanner, or the like (not shown). These and other input devices are connected to the processing unit(s) 202 through input interface(s) 242 that is coupled to bus 206, but may be connected by other interface and bus structures, such as a parallel port, game port, or a universal serial bus (USB).

A monitor 256 or other type of display device is also connected to bus 206 via an interface, such as a video adapter 244. In addition to the monitor, personal computers typically include other peripheral output devices (not shown), such as speakers and printers, which may be connected through output peripheral interface 246.

Computer 200 may operate in a networked environment using logical connections to one or more remote computers, such as a remote computer 250. Remote computer 250 may include many or all of the elements and features described herein relative to computer 200 including, for example, render engine 222 and one or more development applications 216 utilizing the resources of render engine 222.

As shown in Fig. 2. computing system 200 is communicatively coupled to remote devices (e.g., remote computer 250) through a local area network (LAN) 251 and a general wide area network (WAN) 252. Such networking environments are commonplace in offices, enterprise-wide computer networks, intranets, and the Internet.

When used in a LAN networking environment, the computer 200 is connected to LAN 251 through a suitable network interface or adapter 248. When used in a WAN networking environment, the computer 200 typically includes a modem 254 or other means for establishing communications

over the WAN 252. The modem 254, which may be internal or external, may be connected to the system bus 206 via the user input interface 242, or other appropriate mechanism.

In a networked environment, program modules depicted relative to the personal computer 200, or portions thereof, may be stored in a remote memory storage device. By way of example, and not limitation, Fig. 2 illustrates remote application programs 216 as residing on a memory device of remote computer 250. It will be appreciated that the network connections shown and described are exemplary and other means of establishing a communications link between the computers may be used.

Applicant respectfully submits that the above-description is sufficient to convey to the skilled artisan that Applicant possessed the subject matter of this claim. As an example, consider the following. In connection with the above description, consider that the instructions, in the form of an application, might first reside on a CD-ROM (a first computer-readable medium) that the user purchases. To access the functionality embodied by the instructions, the user brings the CD-ROM home and installs the application on their computer whereupon the instructions are provided onto at least a second computer readable medium, e.g. the computer's hard disk.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection of this claim.

§101 Rejections

Claims 21, 29 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office argues that program codes per se are not statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended these claims to recite, for example, that the video application of claim 21 is

embodied on a computer readable medium; that the editing application of claim 29 is embodied on a computer readable medium; and that the editing application of claim 47 is embodied on a computer readable medium.

As such, each of these claims recites statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Office's rejection.

§102 and 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7, 9-14, 16, 18-33, 35, 37-41, 43 and 45-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,069,668 to Woodham, Jr. et al. (hereinafter "Woodham").

Claims 4, 5, 8, 15, 17, 34, 36, 42 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Woodham.

Before undertaking a discussion of the substance of the Office's rejections, the following discussion of Applicant's disclosure is provided in an attempt to assist the Office in appreciating certain distinctions between the claimed subject matter and Woodham.

Applicant's Disclosure

Transitions from one video to another can be implemented in different ways. One popular way of implementing a transition is through the use of a bitmap and in particular, a gray scale bit map. Other types of bits maps however, e.g. color bit maps, can be used. Typically, gray scale bitmaps, used for transitions, are individually designed by a human designer with the aid of a software application. The use of a gray scale bit map allows one video to visually replace another video in often times creative ways.

Fig. 40 shows an exemplary gray scale bit map generally at 4000 and a display 4002 that contains two videos 4004 and 4006 that are in the midst of a transition called a "wipe". In the illustrated wipe effect, video 4006 constitutes the old video and video 4004 constitutes the new video. A boundary line 4008 can be seen between the two videos and is moving to the right. As the boundary line moves to the right, more and more of video 4004 replaces video 4006. To effect this transition, bit map 4000 is used in the following way.

Bit map 4000 includes a large number of pixels, e.g. 300x300 or 90,000 pixels. Each pixel is capable of having a value which is one of a predetermined number of gray scale values which represent shades of gray. For example, in this case, assume that there are 256 shades of gray, each ranging in value from 0 (black) to 255 (white). Pixels at the far left of bitmap 4000 have gray scale values that are lower than pixels at the far right of the illustrated bitmap. A programmatic loop is defined such as that illustrated below:

```
For Z = 0 to 255,
    Walk the picture
    If (color < Z) show the new video, else show the old video
```

What this loop does is that it walks through the bitmap for each frame of video. If pixel values in the bitmap are less than Z for a given frame, the new video is shown. If the pixel values for a given frame are greater than Z, then the old video is shown. In the Fig. 40 example, on the first pass (for the first frame), Z=0. Since no pixels are less than 0, the new video is not shown. As Z gets incremented and one proceeds through the bitmap, the new video slides in from

the left. Algorithms such as this can be used to implement hundreds of different kinds of effects and transitions, just by changing the bitmap.

As an example of another type of transition that can be implemented using gray scale bit maps, consider Fig. 41. There, a bitmap 4100 in the form of a dark star in the middle, with lighter and lighter stars surrounding the dark star is shown. When this bitmap is used to effect a transition between videos, a small star emerges from the middle of the display and grows in time so that the new video replaces the old video. For example, in display 4102, a new video 4104 is shown replacing old video 4106 and is emerging through a star wipe that is provided by bitmap 4100.

One of the problems associated with using bitmaps for transitions and effects is that each bitmap must typically be individually designed and configured by a human designer. Thus, in the above example, a human designer was required to design both bitmaps 4000 and 4100. There are instances when it would be convenient and highly economical to assist the human designer with the task of designing bitmaps that are used for video effects. For example, assume that a designer wished to take bitmap 4100 and operate upon it in some manner to provide an entirely new derived bitmap that still has some of the characteristics of bitmap 4100. Until now, the designer would be forced to manually design the new bitmap.

Consider, for example, Fig. 42 which shows a bit map 4200 that is derived from bitmap 4100. In this instance, bitmap 4200 includes six dark star portions with lighter and lighter stars surrounding each dark star portion. When used to provide a transition, bitmap 4200 provides a display such as that shown at 4202.

In the past, bitmap 4202 would have been hand designed by a human designer. Advantageously, this need no longer be the case.

Fig. 43 shows an exemplary bitmap processor 4300 in accordance with one embodiment. The bitmap processor receives as input a bit map which is designated in the drawing as "Old Bitmap". The processor processes the old bit map and provides, from the old bit map a "New Bitmap". This can advantageously be done "on the fly" so that a user who is editing a project can have the flexibility to modify, in a robust number of ways, multiple different bit maps that can be used for transitions and effects. The bitmap processor 4300 is configured to implement a number of different operations on a bitmap that it receives.

Note that the bitmaps that are described above do not comprise the content of either of the video clips between which a transition is effected.

The Office's Arguments

Claim 1 has been amended and recites a software-implemented video rendering system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a video application configured to enable a user to combine multiple different video clips; and
- a bitmap processor operatively coupled with the video application and configured to receive a first bitmap that can be used to render a transition between video clips and automatically process the first bitmap to provide a different transition between video clips, ***wherein the first bitmap does not comprise video clip content.***

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a system that receives a first bitmap and cites to Woodham's video frame

(discussed in column 3, lines 44-45). The Office argues that Woodham's video frame is used to render a transition between video clips. Further, the Office argues that Woodham discloses automatically processing the first bitmap to provide a different transition.

Applicant has amended this claim to clarify that the first bitmap does not comprise video clip content. Support for this clarifying amendment can be found in the Specification, particularly in Figs. 41 and 42 and the related discussion.

Woodham, on the other hand, discloses a digital video effects system that captures a frame of live action video (i.e. video content), writes it into RAM, and uses the raster-order addresses of the video content to effect a transition. Specifically, as perhaps best illustrated in Woodham's Fig. 1, video content raster-order addresses X_{in} and Y_{in} are provided to transform components 10a, 10b which transform the raster-order addresses into transformed coordinates X_1, Y_1 and X_2, Y_2. Transformed coordinates X_2, Y_2 are then used as indexes into tables 20, 30 and 40 to produce output values which are then further processed and then summed by components 82, 84 with transformed coordinates X_1, Y_1 to provide resulting offset coordinates X_{out}, Y_{out}. The resulting offset coordinates are then used as readout addresses to access pixels from the transformation RAM that contains previously read-in video content.

As this claim has been clarified to recite that the bitmap that can be used to render a transition does not comprise video clip content, not only does Woodham not anticipate this claim, but it teaches directly away therefrom. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited

features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another. In addition, claims 4, 5 and 8 stand rejected under § 103 over Woodham.

With respect to **claim 4**, which recites a stretching and shrinking module that is configured to shrink or stretch, respectively, the first bitmap, the Office argues that Woodham discloses stretching the first bitmap and cites to column 5, lines 20-22 for support. Further, the Office argues that since shrinking is the mirror image of stretching, it would be obvious to modify Woodham to provide for shrinking the bitmap. As motivation, the Office argues that the motivation would be "for adjusting the stretching of the bitmap". The Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for a couple of different reasons.

First, the excerpt cited by the Office in support of this rejection pertains to stretching the texture of a *texture effect*. Earlier in this passage, texture effects are described to include mapping of live video onto a variety of surfaces such as woven fabric, rough paper and the like. See, e.g. column 5, lines 15-18. The passage cited by the Office states, in effect, that texture effects can be made to stretch the texture in any 2D direction. Thus, it is at best unclear whether Woodham is referring to stretching only the texture or something else. Assuming however, for the sake of argument alone, that what is referenced by Woodham to be stretched is indeed live video having been mapped onto a textured surface, it is clear, particularly in view of the clarifying amendment to claim 1 above, that this excerpt of Woodham neither discloses nor suggests stretching a bitmap that does not comprise video clip content. In fact, Woodham teaches directly away therefrom. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

With respect to **claim 5** which recites a replication module that is configured to replicate the first bitmap, the Office argues that while Woodham teaches nothing of the sort, such would be an obvious modification because "replication is well known in the computer art." As a motivation, the Office argues that one would be motivated to make such a modification "for providing a copy of the bitmap".

Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Specifically, it is irrelevant, to a large extent, whether replication in general is well known in the computer art. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, there must be specific teachings either in the cited references or the prior art in general to support the modification of a reference. Further, the motivation to make such a modification must be supported by particular findings. In this instance, the Office has only generally and in a circular fashion, argued that it would be obvious to modify Woodham in the manner proposed. Accordingly, the Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness and this claim is allowable.

Claim 8 recites subject matter that includes the subject matter from both claims 4 and 5. Hence, for all of the reasons set forth above with respect to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, this claim is allowable.

Claim 12 recites a method of displaying a video comprising:

- selecting a bitmap that ***defines*** a first transition that can be used to transition between video clips;
- operating upon the bitmap to provide a second transition that is different from the first transition by using one or more parameters

that are provided by a user, the parameters being used to operate upon the bitmap; and

- effecting the second transition between video clips.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. As such, Woodham does not anticipate this claim. Accordingly, this claim is allowable.

Claims 13-22 depend from claim 12 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 12, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

In addition, **claims 15 and 17** stand rejected under §103 over Woodham. Claim 15 depends from claim 12 and recites that the act of operating comprises shrinking the first-mentioned bitmap. Claim 17 depends from claim 12 and recites that the act of operating comprises replicating the first-mentioned bitmap. In rejecting these claims, the Office uses the same rationale as it did with respect to claims 4 and 5 respectively. Thus, for the same reasons set forth with respect to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the rejections of claim 4 and 5 respectively, claims 15 and 17 are allowable.

Claim 23 recites a method of displaying a multi-media editing project comprising:

- receiving one or more parameters from a user, the parameters being associated with a multi-media editing project and relating to a transition that can be applied between two video clips in the project;
- ***selecting a bitmap that defines a first transition*** that can be used to transition between the video clips;
- operating upon the bitmap to provide a second transition that is different from the first transition by using the one or more parameters; and
- effecting the second transition between video clips.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Woodham. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 27 has been amended and recites one or more computer-readable media having computer-readable instructions thereon which, when executed by a computer, cause the computer to [added language appears in bold italics]:

- select a first bitmap ***that defines*** a transition that can be applied between two video clips in a video editing project;

operate upon the first bitmap to provide a second bitmap that is different from the first bitmap by using one or more parameters that are provided by a user, the first bitmap being operated upon by operations comprising one or more of the following operations: stretching, shrinking, replicating, and offsetting; and

- use the second bitmap in a transition between at least two videos.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a first bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Woodham. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claim 28 has been amended and recites a software-implemented method of displaying a multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- providing a user interface (UI) through which a user can enter one or more parameters that can be used to manipulate a bitmap-defined transition;
- receiving one or more parameters that are entered by a user via the UI;
- selecting a first bitmap ***that defines a transition and is*** associated with the one or more parameters entered by the user;
- automatically operating upon the ***first*** bitmap to provide a second bitmap ***that defines a transition*** that is different from the ***transition defined by the*** first bitmap by using the one or more parameters that are provided by a user, said operating comprising performing one or more of the following operations on the first bitmap: stretching, shrinking, replicating, and offsetting; and
- using the second bitmap in a transition between at least two videos.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a first bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Woodham. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claim 29 depends from claim 28 and is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 28, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 30 has been amended and recites a multi-media project editing system comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- a software implemented bitmap processor configured for use in connection with a multi-media editing application to effect a transition between different videos, the bitmap processor being configured to:
- receive one or more parameters from a user;
- select a first bitmap that ***defines*** a first transition between two videos;
- operate upon the first bitmap in accordance with the one or more parameters to provide a second transition that is different from the first transition; and
- apply the ***second*** transition between two videos.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a first bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video

frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Woodham. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claims 31-38 depend from claim 30 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 30, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

In addition, claims 34 and 36 stand rejected under §103 over Woodham. Claim 34 depends from claim 31 and recites that the bitmap processor can operate upon the first bitmap by shrinking the first bitmap. Claim 36 depends from claim 31 and recites that the bitmap processor can operate upon the first bitmap by replicating the first bitmap. In rejecting these claims, the Office uses the same rationale as it did with respect to claims 4 and 5 respectively. Thus, for the same reasons set forth with respect to the Office's failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the rejections of claim 4 and 5 respectively, claims 34 and 36 are allowable.

Claim 39 has been amended and recites a method of displaying a multi-media editing project comprising [added language appears in bold italics]:

- selecting a ***first*** bitmap comprising multiple pixels, each pixel being capable of having one of a number of predetermined of gray scale values, the ***first*** bitmap ***defining*** a transition between two videos in a multi-media editing project;

- operating upon the selected ***first*** bitmap to provide a second bitmap that is different from the first bitmap by using one or more parameters that are provided by a user, ***the second bit map defining a different transition***;
- rescaling the second bitmap to ensure that pixels of the second bit map have, collectively, all of the predetermined gray scale values; and
- using the second bitmap in a transition between at least two videos.

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Woodham discloses a first bitmap as recited in this claim and cites to Woodham's video frame discussed in column 3, lines 44-45. Applicant respectfully disagrees that Woodham anticipates the subject matter of this claim. Specifically, Woodham's video frame does not ***define*** a first transition. Rather, Woodham's video frame is the subject ***of*** a transition. Accordingly, this claim is not anticipated by Woodham. As such, this claim is allowable.

Claims 40-48 depend from claim 39 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are neither disclosed nor suggested in the references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

In addition, claims 42 and 44 stand rejected under §103 over Woodham. Claim 42 depends from claim 39 and recites that the act of operating comprises shrinking the selected bitmap. Claim 44 depends from claim 39 and recites that the act of operating comprises replicating the selected bitmap. In rejecting these claims, the Office uses the same rationale as it did with respect to claims 4 and 5 respectively. Thus, for the same reasons set forth with respect to the Office's

failure to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in the rejections of claim 4 and 5 respectively, claims 42 and 44 are allowable.

Conclusion

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 12/18/03

By: _____

Lance R. Sadler
Reg. No. 38,605
(509) 324-9256